

REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the application is noted with appreciation.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action dated December 23, 2003, the Examiner objected to the disclosure due to the following informalities: on page 1, line 13 the word "possess" is misspelled; on page 2, line 22, "polyisocyanate is broken with a dash; on page 2, line 22, the word "anorganic" is not understood; on page 4, line 21, the word "hybride" is not understood; on page 4, line 36 the word "initially" is broken with a dash; and on page 9, line 29, the word "reaction" is broken with a dash.

The Amendments to the Specification of this action correct the words "possess", "polyisocyanate", "initially", and "reaction". The term "anorganic" means "of an inorganic basis," such as sodium, potassium, barium, and hydroxide. The term "hybride" means a "polymer mixture." This information should appropriately correct all of the informalities to the disclosure identified by the Examiner.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 3 because the word "the" should be "a" because of the lack of an antecedent basis in the previous claim. In the Amendments to the Claims of this action, claim 3 has been corrected to read "a tertiary amine".

In addition, claim 11 and 12 were rejected by the Examiner because there was no antecedent basis for "vinylc monomers". Claim 11 now depends from claim 4, thus providing the antecedent basis. Accordingly, claims 3, 11 and 12 are now allowable.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5, 6, 8 and 17 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner stated that claims 5, 6, 8 and 17 were broader than claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended by adding the statement "or wherein R, R<sup>1</sup> and/or R<sup>2</sup> are H". This amendment clarifies that not all R-groups can have the meaning of hydrogen; only those that are R, R<sup>1</sup> and/or R<sup>2</sup> may have the meaning of hydrogen. Therefore, claims 5, 6 and 17 now further limit the subject

matter of the previous claim. Accordingly, we believe claims 5, 6 and 17 are now of proper dependent form. Claim 8 has been canceled.

An earnest attempt has been made to respond to each and every ground of rejection advanced by the Examiner, without introduction of new matter or raising new issues. However, should the Examiner have any queries, suggestions or comments relating to a speedy disposition of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PEACOCK, MYERS & ADAMS, P.C.

By: 

Jeffrey D. Myers  
Reg. No. 35,964  
Direct Dial: (505) 998-1502

Attorney for Applicant  
P.O. Box 26927  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927  
Phone: (505) 998-1500  
Fax: (505) 243-2542

**Customer No. 005179**

G:\AMDS\Los&Stig\Stahl740.AF.doc